

Interview Summary	Application No. <u>09/718,071</u>	Applicant(s) HSU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gina C. Yu	1617

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gina C. Yu

(3) Tara Agnew

(2) Sreeni Padmanabhan

(4) _____

Date of Interview: May 11, 2004

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 13

Identification of prior art discussed: Krysik and Hammond

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicants indicated that they will consider incorporating the limitation of claim 13 to claim 1 and amend the weight limitation of the 2nd surfactant to 30-60% to overcome Krysik. Examiner indicated that further search and consideration will be needed.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required